Subject No. 110
Mirasi to village servants.

Summary of discussion.—(*a*) The enforced levy of miras is a hardship upon land holders and may be abolished, totis and talaris being paid a cash salary by Government.

(*b*) At any rate such abolition may be orderd in the case of Inam lands.

Mr. C. Srinivasa Rao of Chikmagalur prayed for its abolition in the Malnad. He urged that the duties of these servants have not been laid down, the rates are excessive and these men do no work for the raiyats, &c. He further enquired whether payment had to be made for uncultivated lands and coffee gardens as well. Mr. Amble Annaiya Pandit spoke against the levy altogether and asked if it was enforceable where there had been no mamul.

Reply of Government.—(*a*) & (*b*). This is an important question and will receive most careful consideration.

Subject No. 111
mission of Khalsat on Inams.

Summary of discussion.—The area found in Inams in excess of what is shown in the accounts has been assessed to Revenue. But as a matter of fact, there is no excess, as the extent shown in the Danapatrikas granted by former Rulers corresponds with what is actually in the enjoyment of Inamdars. A reference may be made to the above documents and the assessment charged remitted. In this respect there ought to be no difference of treatment between temple Inams and personal Inams. Khalsat has further been imposed upon the best portion of the land. This is hard upon the raiyats concerned.

Mr. Nadig Sivappa of Sorab represented that in Malnad, only 10 per cent has been allowed instead of 50 per cent.

Reply of Government.—The Government will waive the objection of limitation, and if any Inamdar comes forward and proves that there has been no excess, the khalsat levied will be removed. The individuals concerned may therefore apply to the Deputy Commissioner who will do the needful. There was nothing to prevent Inamdars from appearing at the time of settlement and exercising their option of having the khalsat imposed upon portions of their own choice. Moreover, the statement that the best portion has been charged with khalsat is understood to be not in accordance with fact. In Malnad the Inam tenure is different. Individual complaints, if any, may be brought to notice.

Subject No. 112
(a) Abolition of Sayer duty in Maidan Districts.

Summary of discussion.—(*a*) Supari gardens require less water than wet lands and yet the owners thereof have to pay a double tax, *viz.*, (1) Land assessment which is in itself higher than that of wet lands and (2) Sayer duty on the produce. The abolition of the latter in the maidan or the grant of such other concession as Government may deem proper is solicited.

Reply of Government.—Noted.

(b) Substitution of enhanced garden assessment for Sayer on Supari.

Summary of discussion.—(*b*) To prevent the annoyance caused by the measuring of arecanut grown in bagayat lands, a reasonable tax may be fixed on the basis of the average yield of the past five years and recovered as Land Revenue.

Per contra, Mr. Amble Annaiya Pandit stated that the remedy proposed was worse than the evil complained of and that the imposition of the additional kandayem was not desirable.

Mr. Srinivas Rao of Chikmagalur observed that the levy of sayer was attended with oppression and that the burden was further unequal in the Malnad and Maidan.

Reply of Government.—The question has been very fully considered and the assessment on supari gardens where excessive has been recently reduced. The proposal to substitute additional land tax for the levy of sayer cannot now be entertained.

Subject No. 113

(a) Amildars' Powers to deal with unauthorized felling or appropriation of Government trees.

Summary of discussion.—Owing to the provision of law that the Deputy Commissioners alone are competent to deal with cases of unauthorized cutting and appropriation of trees on Government lands, small offences go unpunished and the destruction of trees on a large scale goes on unnoticed. Amildars may, therefore, be empowered to deal with such small cases within defined limits.

Reply of Government.—Noted for consideration and enquiry.

(b) To deal with cases of injury to boundary marks.

Summary of discussion.—Amildars may be invested with power to deal with cases of offences punishable under Section 133 of the Land Revenue Code, *viz.*, cases of injury to boundary marks.

Reply of Government.—Noted for consideration. There have, however, not been many cases of the kind.

(c) To try Revenue Cases.

Summary of discussion.—Amildars should not only continue to exercise Police powers but should also be invested with power to entertain as in former days suits filed on the Revenue side for the recovery of sums due to landholders by tenants to the extent of Rs. 300.

Reply of Government.—Noted. The subject is not free from difficulty and requires very careful consideration.

Subject No. 114

Assessed lands lying waste for less than three years should not be sold when Darkhast is received.

Summary of discussion.—Under Land Revenue Rules all lands including wet lands relinquished within three years preceding the date of application have to be sold by auction. This is as prejudicial to raiyats as to Government. The holder of a wet land resigns it as soon as it ceases to be productive and there is no object gained by putting it to auction. On the contrary, what ought to be sold by such